

175987
00048

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION V

DATE: OCT 25 1989

SUBJECT: Hi-Mill Contracting Issue

FROM: Mary Elaine Gustafson, RPM *MEG*
Michigan/Wisconsin Unit #3

TO: Official File

When contacted by the PRP's attorneys regarding the change of contractor's, my initial thought was that Techna had made sufficient improvement to support the decision to retain them. After continued deliberation and some discussion with Techna, I thought my decision was made to hastily. I again spoke with Hi-Mill's council and explained to them, it might be prudent to make a change now, if the PRPs wanted a change and explained my concerns with Techna's performance.

The PRPs and their attorneys had been meeting at the time of this conversation and continued their meeting for two additional hours. They called me at the end of the meeting and informed me that Techna's performance had improved tremendously since I took over the project and with my direction and guidance, they believe Techna can do the job, so they agreed to keep Techna as their contractor in order to avoid more delay and additional costs.

cc: Doug Ballotti, RERB